

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are presented for examination, with Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 having been withdrawn. The text of the withdrawn Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 is properly included in the Listing of Claims. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the rejections should be withdrawn and that the Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa, Japanese Publication No. 09-117567 ("Hasegawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,001,016 to Walker *et al.* ("Walker"). For at least the following reasons, the Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof. The Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must: (1) identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the teachings of the references; and (2) show that the references teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

CLAIM 1

The Applicant respectfully submits that Hasegawa and Walker fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. The Examiner acknowledged that Hasegawa does not teach a medal keeping and paying system connected to a network. However, the Examiner alleged that Walker discloses a credit and player system connected to a network, and that Walker in combination with Hasegawa renders the claimed invention unpatentable.

Walker discloses a network architecture system that differs from the system recited by Claim 1. Walker discloses a remote wagering terminal connected to a server through a terminal network, and slot machines that are connected to the server through a slot network. [3:60 – 4:22 and Fig. 1]. Walker discloses a system wherein the CPU 410 of the

server 4 accesses a data storage device 440 internally through an internal bus or the like, without passing over/through the network communication port 450. [6:1-2 and Fig. 3]. As illustrated in Figure 3, Walker does not connect the CPU 410 of the server 4 with the data storage device 440 through a communication port 450. In contrast, the clients 2, 5 and 6 access the data storage device 440 by first passing through the network communication port 450. [Fig. 3]. Thus in Walker, the clients 2, 5 and 6, and the server 4, gain access to the data storage device 440 through different routes (*i.e.*, the route for the clients 2, 5 and 6 first passes through the network communication port 450, whereas the server 4 uses a direct internal route that does not pass through the network communication port 450). [Fig. 3].

Walker does not describe or suggest a medal keeping and paying system as recited by Claim 1, wherein each of the processing sections of the medal keeping and paying server apparatus and the plurality of medal keeping and paying client apparatus include a network interface, wherein all the processing sections of the server and the clients access the information storing means by passing across the network. In particular, Walker does not disclose or suggest “each of the processing sections of the medal keeping and paying server apparatus and each of the plurality of medal keeping and paying client apparatus include a network interface, the processing section of the medal keeping and paying server apparatus is connected with the operation information storing means of the medal keeping and paying server apparatus through the network interface thereof, and the processing sections cooperate to connect between the medal keeping and paying server apparatus and each of the plurality of medal keeping and paying client apparatus through a network, thereby connecting the processing section of each of the plurality of the medal keeping and paying client apparatus with the operation information storing means of the medal keeping and paying server apparatus through the network interface of the medal keeping and paying server apparatus” as recited by Claim 1. According to Claim 1, “each of the processing sections of the medal keeping and paying server apparatus and each of the

plurality of medal keeping and paying client apparatus include a network interface” and all the processing sections access the same operation information storing means through a network interface (*i.e.*, all access the information storing means across the network). Thus, the present invention as recited by Claim 1, can adopt a single program for data access between all the processing sections and the operation information storing means (*i.e.*, there is only one route, in contrast to the multiple routes disclosed by Walker). [See 0060] Walker does not describe or suggest the network structure or operation of the medal keeping and paying system as recited by Claim 1. None of the drawings or corresponding sections of the detailed description of Walker cited by the Examiner show otherwise.

Therefore, the Examiner has failed to show that Hasegawa in combination with Walker teaches or suggests all the elements of Claim 1. Thus Claim 1 is patentable over Hasegawa in view of Walker and the rejection should be withdrawn.


CLAIMS 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are ultimately dependent from Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons discussed above, Claims 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are patentable over Hasegawa in view of Walker and the rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Notice of Non-compliant Amendment identified above. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11 are pending in this application. Applicant believes this application is now in condition for allowance and solicits a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addresses via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned as 404.685.6799. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,


Brenda O. Holmes, Esq.

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
(404) 815-6500 (direct)
(404) 815-6555 (fax)
Attorney Docket No.: 45762/264216
Date: July 2, 2007